UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/964,785	09/26/2001	Gary K. Loda	SUREB-58450	3304	
39607 7590 01/11/2007 EXAMINER					
LUCE, FORW	ARD, HAMILTON, SO	JASTRZAB, KRISANNE MARIE			
600 WEST BROADWAY SUITE 2600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN DIEGO, O	CA 92101	1744			
			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO	NTHS	01/11/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	A constitution of the	,/			
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)	V			
		09/964,785	LODA ET AL.				
	Omec Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit.				
	The MAIL ING DATE AND	Krisanne Jastrzab	1744				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence addre	'SS			
VVHI(- Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI . cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this comm RANDONED (35 U.S.C. 6 133)				
Status	,						
1)[\inf	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 O	ctober 2006					
		action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 34,35,47,48 and 51-66 is/are pending	in the application					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	Claim(s) <u>34,35,47,48 and 51-66</u> is/are rejected						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.					
	ion Papers	·					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine		haraba Farandara	•			
10)	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
				1.404(1)			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcting The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119	ammer. Note the attached	d Office Action of form PTO-	152.			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		received in this National Sta	ge			
* 0	application from the International Bureau						
	See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachmen	• •		•				
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application				
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1744

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 34-35, 47-48 and 51-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotler et al., U.S. patent No. 6,504,898 B1 in view of Bergeret et al., U.S. patent No. 4,852,138 and Allen et al., U.S. patent No. 6,492,645.

Kotler et al., clearly teach a method and apparatus for optimizing the irradiation of products wherein maximum and minimum dose rates are determined for the given geometry, such as thickness, of the product to be treated and the intensity of the radiation applied is modified such that the entire product receives the optimal amount of radiation consistently. The modification of the radiation is achieved by means adjustably modulating the shape of the radiation generated by moving plates into and out of the path of radiation during the radiation process. See column 1, lines 20-25, column 3, lines 10-15, column 4, lines 1-15 and 40-50, column 6, line 45, column 7, lines 25-35 and lines 65-68, column 8, lines 1-47, column 9, lines 25-60, and column 12, lines 60-68.

Bergeret et al., teach a method and apparatus for optimizing the irradiation of products to control the max/min radiation dose received which includes the teaching that irradiation can be performed in any known manner, either a cylindrical source with the products being rotated such that all sides are irradiated, or a two source configuration where the products are passed there between such that opposite sides

Art Unit: 1744

are controllably irradiated. Bergeret et al., further teach that a larger number of products can be processed with a two source panel system, then a cylindrical system because the total quantity of products that can be irradiated simultaneously is larger. See column 2, lines 56-68, column 3, lines 1-23 and lines 65-68, column 4, lines 1-16, column 5, lines 32-38 and claim 2.

Allen et al., clearly teach a method and apparatus for the irradiation of articles wherein a conveyor system is provided having two converging conveyors moving at different speeds and having a gap therebetween with radiation sources provided on both sides thereof to irradiate products carried by the conveyors. Allen et al., further teaches the desire to maintain a uniform dose rate throughout the articles being sterilized. See column 5, lines 50-68, column 6, lines 33-50 column 8, lines 7-15 and column 9, lines 40-all of column 10.

It would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute plural sources for irradiation and the conveyed system, as taught in Bergeret et al. and Allen et al., in the system of Kotler et al., because it would allow for the simultaneous treatment of a larger number of products, including those with non-uniform geometries, while maintaining the dose control functions with adjustable radiation.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/25/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 1744

Applicant continues to argue that configuration of Kotler as set forth in the rejection by the Examiner would render Kotler inoperable because the results recited are dependent on rotation of the articles, but the Examiner would disagree and would note that the combination set forth above functions to achieve the results of Kotler with plural sources and article conveyance which eliminates the need for rotation while still maintaining optimum dose control.

Applicant further argues that the moving plates of Kotler fail to meet the limitation of radiation reducing means being moved into and out of the path of radiation, however, the Examiner would continue to disagree and note the adjustable collimator is made up of moving plates which are moved into and out of the path of radiation to control the path width thereof.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/964,785

Art Unit: 1744

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisanne Jastrzab whose telephone number is 571-272-1279. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. 6:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gladys Corcoran can be reached on 571-272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Krisanne Jastrzab Primary Examiner Art Unit 1744

January 8, 2007